

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/002,616		12/05/2001	Paul Smith	P 284196 PE WEAR	1946	
909	7590	02/17/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	BURY WINTHROP, LLP LU, C CAIXIA				CAIXIA	
	. BOX 10500 LEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				1713		

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	10/002,616	SMITH ET AL.	$(\mathcal{O}(1))$					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Caixia Lu	1713						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	ation in					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final reject IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appu unt of the fee. The app priginally set in the final	ion. See MPEP ropriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:							
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);						
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);							
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	a better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the					
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	ıs.					
NOTE:								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):							
4 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which wer	e newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•						
10. Other:								
		Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1713						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same retionale as set forth in the previous Office action mailed on October 21, 2003. The support of the cited molecular weight range of "100,000 to 1,000,000 g/mol" is cited in the Office action which is in col. 24, line 3 of Jacobsen et al. (5,834,393). Applicants argue that it is improper hindsight reconstruction to use applicants' Comparative Examples in Table 1. The Comparative Examples cited in the action is for supporting what is known in the art, and, thus, supporting the wear coefficients of polymers with molecular weight of 1,000,000 of '393 to be in the claimed range inherently. The burden is on the applicants to prove otherwise. This is not hindsight.